UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,758	09/17/2003	William Patrick Tunney	11884/404001	3826

23838   7590   04/04/2007

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action ***Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***	*10/663,758*	TUNNEY, WILLIAM PATRICK	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Li B. Zhen	2194	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>19 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☒ Other: <u>*IDS, 1/23/2007*</u>

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive. In response to the Final Office Action dated 01/19/2007, applicant argues:

(1) col. 8:5-23 does not teach Iterator 36 determining the format of a collection from a format definition, as in Applicant's claims. [p. 2, 4 - 5]

(2) col. 10: 1-13 merely refers to the creation of a query object to execute a query, which is not done by an iterator [p. 2, 5]

(3) col. 18:35-45, does not teach an iterator associating an iterator-created reader object with a collection [p. 2].

(4) col. 7:57-col. 8:25, does not teach an iterator created reader object extracting elements from a collection, as in Applicant's claims. [p. 3, 5]

(5) Chang col. 21 :3-30 does not teach an iterator performing the instantiating, as in Applicant's claim 28 [p. 3, 4, 6]

In response to argument (1), examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the iterator in Chang has sub-classes that are specific to each collection type. When iterator access a collection of a specific type, it will determine which sub-class is specific to the collection that the iterator wants to access. By determining which sub-class to use for the different types of collections, the iterator determines the format of the collection and identifies the sub-class to use.

As to argument (2), examiner disagrees and notes Chang discloses a QueryableCollection that supports sorting and bidirectional iterators, and is queries [col. 14, lines 33 - 60]. Therefore, the iterators and query objects are part of the same main program QueryableCollection.java that can make calls to instantiate the iterator and query objects [col. 15, lines 13 - 43].

As to argument (3), examiner disagrees and notes that Chang teaches query objects are associated with specific datastores [col. 18, lines 35 - 45].

As to argument (4), examiner disagrees and notes that Chang teaches extracting elements from a collection [Object evaluate(String query, short ql_type, NVPair params[]), which is used to extract elements from the collection; col. 18, lines 25 - 45].

In response to argument (5), examiner disagrees and notes that Chang teaches instantiating a set of objects representing the set of elements [col. 15, lines 25 - 42].

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER